UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/921,167	08/02/2001	Simon Bennett	ZMS-00101	7201

26339	7590	12/10/2004

PATENT GROUP
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART
EXCHANGE PLACE, 53 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA   02109

EXAMINER
CLARK, ISAAC R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 12/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/921,167	BENNETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Isaac R Clark	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 August 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-40* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *01/17/2002* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
   application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>08/02/2001</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

Priority

2.   The applicant claims priority under 35 USC § 119(e) from Provisional Application

No. 60/225,603 filed 08/15/2000.

Drawings

3.   The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on 01/17/002 are

acceptable for examination proceedings.

Claim Objections

4.   Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 15 is missing a comma or other punctuation separating "a game" from

"ringtones".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   Claims 8 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

7.   As per claim 8, claim 8 recites the limitation "said message delivery method" in

line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because the

"message delivery method" is recited as an optional element in claim 7 on which claim 8

depends. When the routing information of claim 7 does not include a message delivery

method, there is no antecedent for "said message delivery method in claim 8".

8.   For the purpose of examining claims 8, claim 8 will be interpreted to require that

the routing information comprise the message delivery method.

9.   As per claim 15, claim 15 recites the limitation "said application" in line 1 of the

claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim because

when either "stock information" or "weather information" are the request described in

claim 14, there is no antecedent for "said application".

10.   For the purpose of examining the claims, claim 15 will be interpreted to require

that the request be for "an application".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.   Claims 1, 2, 20-23, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Coveley et al. (PCT Published Application WO 99/33226) hereinafter

Coveley in view of Yu et al. (US Patent 6,535,746) hereinafter Yu.

13.   As per claim 1, Coveley teaches a method executed in a computer system (Fig. 1

item 12) for routing a message from a sender (Fig. 1 item 14) in a first digital mobile

network to a receiver (Fig. 1 item 14) in a second different digital mobile network

comprising (Page 5, lines 11-20): forwarding said message to a server from said

sender, said server being connected to said first and said second digital mobile network

(Page 5, lines 15-18); and forwarding said message to said receiver in accordance with

routing path information corresponding to the receiver (Page 9, line 5 – Page 10, line 5).

14.   Coveley fails to explicitly teach that the corresponding routing path information

for the receiver is obtained by relating, using a routing database, an identification

number associated with the receiver to corresponding routing path information

associated with the second digital mobile network

15.   Yu teaches obtaining routing path information for the receiver by relating an

identification number associated with the receiver to routing path information using a

routing database (col. 4, lines 18-38).

16.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Yu to use a receiver

identification number to obtain routing path information because they both deal with the

communication of messages between mobile terminals in different networks.

Furthermore, the teaching of Yu to use a receiver identification number to obtain routing

information from a routing database allows the routing to be done transparently in

diverse environments (col. 4, lines 50-55).

17.   As per claim 2, Coveley teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

reformatting said message in a format specified in said corresponding routing path

information, wherein reformatting is transparent to a sender and receiver of the

message (Abstract; Page 13, line 5-16).

18.   As per claim 20, Coveley teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said computer

system includes said server (Fig. 1, item 12) and a plurality of different digital mobile

networks (page 14, lines 28-31), said plurality of different digital mobile networks

including said first and said second digital mobile networks, communications within said

computer system being represented as a hub-like structure with said server as the

center and each of said plurality of digital mobile networks being a spoke extending

from said server (Fig. 1) , all communications between any two of said plurality of digital

mobile networks being facilitated by said server (page 5, lines 11-20).

19.   As per claim 21, Coveley teaches the method of claim 20, wherein the message

is sent between a sender and receiver independent of operator, location, and network

protocols using said server (page 2, lines 1-10; page 14, lines 13-33).

20.   As per claims 22 and 23, claims 22 and 23 describe a computer program product

comprising machine executable code for carrying out the method steps described in

claims 1 and 2 respectively.

21.   Coveley teaches that the message routing the sender to receiver is carried out

on processors in the sender, receiver and server computers (page 17, lines 19- page

18, line 6) which inherently requires machine executable code to carry out the process

steps.

22.   Claims 39 and 40 describe a computer program product carrying out the same

method steps as in claims 20 and 21. Claims 39 and 40 are rejected for the same

reasons as claims 20 and 21.

23.   Claims 3, 4, 24, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Coveley and Yu as applied respectively to claims 1 and 2 above, and

further in view of Belpaire (European Patent Application EP 0777394 A1).

24.   As per claim 3, Coveley fails to explicitly teach the method of claim 1, wherein

said message is a short message service message.

25.   Belpaire teaches that the receiver receives the message as short message

service transmissions (col. 3, lines 23-32).

26.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Belpaire to transmit short

message service messages using the method of Coveley because they both deal with

transmitting messages between different networks using diverse protocols.

Furthermore, the teaching of Belpaire to use short message service format would allow

sending email messages as a series of short message service messages to a mobile

terminal incapable of handling large email messages (Belpaire col. 8, lines 40-52).

27.   As per claim 4, Coveley fails to explicitly teach the method of claim 2, wherein

the sender sends the message and the receiver receives the message using at least

one of: digital mobile device connected to the internet, digital mobile device connected

to the server through a service center of an associated mobile network operator and a

computer system connected to the internet.

28.   Belpaire teaches that the receiver receives the message via either a digital

mobile device (Fig. 1, MT1) through a service center (Fig. 1, SMSC) of an associated

mobile network operator or a computer system connected to the Internet (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 50-54).

29.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Belpaire because they both deal with transmitting messages between different networks using diverse protocols. Furthermore, the teaching of Belpaire to receive the message via a digital mobile device connected to a service center allows email messages to be received on a terminal which can support a length limited short message capability (Belpaire, col. 2, lines 2-6). The teaching of Belpaire to have the receiver receive the message via a computer system connected to the Internet allows for bi-directional communication between a mobile device and a fixed terminal (Belpaire, col.3, lines 50-51).

30.   Claims 24 and 25 describe a computer program product carrying out the same method as claims 3 and 4. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 3 and 4.

31.   Claims 5 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley and Yu as applied to claim 1 in view of Chandnani et al. (US Published Application 2001/0016495) hereinafter Chandnani.

32.   As per claim 5, Coveley fails to explicitly teach the method of claim 1, further comprising: performing a first query using the routing database to determine a countrywide mobile identification number format of a country associated with the receiver.

33.   Chandnani teaches that the countrywide mobile identification number format varies in length from country (Paragraph [0006]; length of MNC and MSIN vary while country code, MCC is fixed at 3 digits, thus IMIS varies in length).

34.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Chandnani to query the routing database with to determine the identification format associated with the receiver's country because they both deal with communications between terminals in different networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Chandnani to obtain the format of the countrywide mobile identification number format would allow checking that the receiver information was of the correct format as well as allowing the identification of the receiver mobile station identifier within the countrywide mobile identifier (Paragraph 0005 and 0006).

35.   Claim 26 describes a computer program product carrying out the same method as claim 5. Claim 26 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 5.

36.   Claims 6, 7, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley, Yu, and Chandnani as applied to claim 5, in view of Bowman et al. (6,735,439) hereinafter Bowman.

37.   As per claim 6, Coveley does not explicitly teach the method of claim 5, further comprising: performing a second query using the routing database to determine if information identifying the receiver is included in the routing database.

38.   Bowman teaches querying a routing database to determine if information identifying the receiver is included in the database (col. 1, lines 32-45).

39.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Bowman to perform a second query using the routing database to determine if information identifying the receiver is located in the routing database because they both deal with the receipt of communications on wireless terminals. Furthermore, the teaching of Bowman to query the routing database for information identifying the receiver would allow determining if the recipient was registered in the network and determining what services the receiver was entitled to receive (Bowman, col. 1, lines 35-38).

40.   As per claim 7, Coveley teaches the method of claim 6, further comprising: performing a third query using the routing database (Fig. 5, Fig. 6, item 212) to determine said routing information associated with the second digital mobile network of the receiver (page 9, lines 22-29), said routing information including at least one of: format of a message, electronic mail address format, and message delivery method (page 10, lines 10-17; page 19, lines 13-18).

41.   Claims 27 and 28 describe a computer program product carrying out the same method as claim 6 and 7 respectively. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 6 and 7 above.

42.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley, Yu, Chandnani and Bowman as applied to claim 7, in view of Belpaire (European Patent Application EP 0777394 A1).

43.   As per claim 8, Coveley does not explicitly teach the method of claim 7,wherein

said message delivery method uses one of: a direct connection to an operator, an

application, and e-mail connection.

44.   Belpaire teaches delivering messages via an email connection ((col. 3, lines 43-

54).

45.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Belpaire to delivery

messages via email because they both deal with transmitting messages between

different networks using diverse protocols. Furthermore, the teaching of Belpaire to

include email as a message delivery method email would allow bidirectional

communication between systems supporting short message service and systems which

support email but not short message service messages (Belpaire, col.3, lines 50-51).

46.   Claims 9-11 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Coveley and Yu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of

Lohtia et al. (US Patent 6,560,456) hereinafter Lohtia.

47.   As per claim 9, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 1, further comprising:

polling said server by the sender for data.

48.   Lohtia teaches polling a server (Fig. 3, item 302) by the sender (Fig. 3, item 301)

for data (col. 2, lines 40-52).

49.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to poll the server for

data because they both deal with communications between diverse networks.

Furthermore, the teaching of Lohtia to poll the server allows automating the requests for

data based on preselected criteria of the sender (col. 1, line 35-39).

50.   As per claim 10, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 9, further comprising:

communicating a request for data to said server.

51.   Lohtia teaches communicating a request for data to said server (col. 8, lines 40-

60).

52.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to communicate the

request for data to the server for data because they both deal with communications

between diverse networks. Furthermore, the teaching of send the request for data to

the server allows the user to customize format and timing of the requests for automated

data retrieval (col. 1, line 15-39).

53.   As per claim 11, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 10 the method of

claim 10, wherein said communicating a request for data to said server further

comprises: directly sending a message to the server requesting information.

54.   Lohtia teaches communicating a request for data to said server further

comprises: directly sending a message to the server requesting information (col. 8, lines

40-47).

55.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to communicate the

request by directly sending a message to the server requesting information for data to

the server for data because they both deal with communications between diverse

networks. Furthermore, the teaching of send the request for data directly to the server allows the user to request information on demand while the server handles any required format changes (Fig. 2, col. 1, line 25-39).

56.   Claims 29, 30, and 31 describe a computer program product carrying out the same method as claim 9, 10 and 11 respectively. Claims 29-31 are rejected for the same reasons as claim 9-11 above.

57.   Claims 12-14 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley, Yu, and Lohtia as applied to claim 10 above in view of Official Notice.

58.   As per claim 12, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 10, wherein said communicating a request for data to said server, further comprises: communicating the request for data to a messaging service center in said first digital mobile network; polling, by said server, the messaging service center for the request; and transmitting the request to said server.

59.   Lohtia teaches communicating a request for data to a message center in the first digital network and transmitting the request to the server (col. 7, lines 30-40).

60.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to communicate the request by directly sending a message to a message center and then transmitting the request to the server because they both deal with communications between diverse networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Lohtia to communicate the requests to a service

center would allow supporting on demand requests for information without modifying

existing MSC software (col. 6, lines 6-20).

61.   Coveley fails to teach that the server polls the message center for requests.   The

Examiner takes 'Official Notice that the use of polling strategies to look for data when

the timing of the data availability is not known is well known in the art.   It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to

pool the service center to determine when a request for data was ready to transmit to

the server because that would allow supporting on demand requests for up current

information (Lohtia, col. 1, lines 30-43).

62.   As per claim 13, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 12, wherein the

request includes a keyword, said keyword being one of: a command and a phone

number.

63.   Lohtia teaches sending a request including a keyword consisting of either a

command (col. 6, lines 36-50) or a phone number (col. 5, lines 25-40).

64.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to send requests

using commands or phone numbers because they both deal with communications

between diverse networks. Furthermore, the teaching of Lohtia to use keywords or

phone numbers would accommodate the limited input facilities on a mobile thus

allowing users to make information requests from their phones.

65.   As per claim 14, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 13, wherein the

request is for at least one of: stock information, weather information for a particular

location identified in the message, an application.

66.   Lohtia teaches requesting stock information or weather information for a

particular location identified in the message (col. 5, lines 25-40).

67.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Lohtia to communicate the

request for stock information to a message center and then polling the message center

by the server because they both deal with communications between diverse networks.

Furthermore, the teaching of Lohtia would provide the user with the means to receive up

to date financial information.

68.   Claims 32, 32, and 34 describe a computer program product carrying out the

same method as claim 12, 13, and 14 respectively. Claims 32-34 are rejected for the

same reasons as claim 12-14 above.

69.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley,

Yu, Lohtia, and Official Notice as applied to claim 14 above in view of Armanto et al.

(US Patent 6,094,587) hereinafter Armanto.

70.   As per claim 15, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 14, wherein said

application is at least one of: a game, ringtones in connection with audio tones, and a

chat service. Coveley does teach the transmission of text messages.

71.   Armanto teaches transmitting ringtones in the form of text messages such as

SMS messages (Abstract; col. 3, lines 13-16).

72.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Armanto because they both deal with communications to wireless terminals. Furthermore, the teaching of Armanto to send ringtones to a mobile station would allow users to easily customize their phones with a distinctive ring (col. 4, lines 30-45).

73.   Claims 16 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley and Yu as applied to claim 1 above, further in view of Helferich (US Patent).

74.   As per claim 16, Coveley teaches method of claim 1 wherein said sender is sending the message to a user in one of plurality of different digital mobile networks (Abstract, page 3, lines 1-22).

75.   As per claim 16, Coveley fails to teach the method of claim 1 wherein said sender is sending the message to a plurality of users, each of said plurality of users receiving the message being on different digital mobile networks.

76.   Helferich teaches sending a message to a plurality of users (col. 10, lines 44-46).

77.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Helferich to send a message to a plurality of users in different digital networks because they both deal with the transmission of messages in a digital mobile network. Furthermore, the teaching of Helferich to automatically send a message to a plurality of users would allow sending information to multiple users without requiring the sender to separately compose messages for each user.

78.   As per claim 35, claim 35 describes a computer program product carrying out the same method as claim 16. Claim 35 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16.

79.   Claims 17, 18, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coveley, Yu and Helferich as applied to claim 16 above further in view of Auerbach et al. (US Patent 6,549,937) hereinafter Auerbach.

80.   As per claim 17, Coveley teaches the method of claim 16, further comprising reformatting messages in accordance with a different digital format for a recipient on a different digital network (page 13, lines 5-17).

81.   Coveley fails to teach determining which of said plurality of users receiving the message are included in a buddy list, said buddy list including user specific information for message recipients.

82.   Auerbach teaches a buddy list which maintains address information and online status of users of network systems.

83.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Auerbach to determine which of the plurality of users was included in a buddy list because they both communications between digital networks with diverse protocols. Furthermore, the teaching of Auerbach to determine whether a user was in the buddy list would allow providing notification that information and messages are available to buddy list members who are currently on line (Auerbach, col. 10, lines 21-29).

84.   As per claim 18, Coveley teaches he method of claim 17, further comprising:

determining if a message recipient is within the first digital mobile network of said

sender (page 9, lines 10-23).

85.   As per claims 36 and 37, claims 36 and 37 describe a computer program product

carrying out the same method as claim 17 and 18 respectively. Claims 36 and 37 are

rejected for the same reasons as claim 17 and 18 above.

86.   Claims 19 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Coveley, Yu, Helferich, and Auerbach as applied to claim 18 above further in view

of Belpaire (European Patent Application EP 0777394 A1).

87.   As per claim 19, Coveley teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising

sending a message from one digital mobile network to a second digital mobile network.

88.   Coveley fails to explicitly teach reformatting an electronic mailing address from a

first format associated with said first digital mobile network to a second format

associated with the second digital mobile network.

89.   Belpaire teaches reformatting an electronic mailing address from a first format

associated with said first digital mobile network to a second format associated with the

second digital mobile network (col. 3, lines 23-37).

90.   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in this art at the time the

invention was made to combine the teaching of Coveley and Belpaire because they

both deal with transmitting messages between networks with different protocols.

Furthermore, the teaching of Belpaire to reformat the electronic mailing address from a

first format to a second format associated with a second digital mobile network would

allow electronic email messages to be delivered to a mailbox in a network using a different protocol than the originating network.

91.   As per claim 38, claim 38 describes a computer program product carrying out the same method as claim 19. Claim 38 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 19.

Conclusion

92.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Method and apparatus for a network independent short message delivery system".

    i.   EPO Application EP 959600   Ramasurbamani et al.
Mulitnetwork communication between mobile networks with differing protocols.

    ii.   WIPO Application WO 9810608   Green, Mark
Sending message to a plurality of recipients in mobile networks

    iii.   US Application 2002/0032800   Puuskari et al.
Translation of network addressing and protocol information between diverse networks

    iv.   US Patent 5,903,726   Donovan et al.
Addressing in digital mobile communications networks

    v.   US Patent 6,603,974   Rollender
Communication across digital mobile communications networks

        vi.   US Patent 6,263,212   Ross et al.

              Converting between SMS formats with differing length restrictions

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isaac R Clark whose telephone number is (571)272-3961. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lrc

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100